



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/588,582

08/07/2006

Johannes Geyer

2004P00256WOUS

9940

46726 7590 01/14/2008  
BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
100 BOSCH BOULEVARD  
NEW BERN, NC 28562

EXAMINER

DZIERZYNSKI, EVAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2875

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/14/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

31

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/588,582	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GEYER, JOHANNES	
	<b>Examiner</b> Evan Dzierzynski	<b>Art Unit</b> 2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 2 "the front side" is objected to and in line 4 "the hand" is objected to for lack of antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 14, 16-18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voda US PAT 2644882 in view of Midlang et al. US PAT 4966004.

As for claims 12 and 21, Voda discloses a domestic appliance 10 comprising a charging opening (fig 1) that is arranged in the front side of a housing and which can be sealed by means of a door 16 and a door frame 17, 18 having a door handle 21 fixed by which the door can be moved with a hand (col 2, ln 29-32), as well as a visual display for the closure state of the door (col 3, ln 45-48) and controllable illumination means (via 39) internal to the device (inside handle portion) to indicate the operating states (col 3, ln 45-48), wherein the door handle is provided with at least one illumination means 38 so that its light can be emitted from the door handle (Fig 3). Voda fails to teach or disclose a visual display for the closure state of the door. Midlang et al. teaches a visual display for a closure state of the door (Fig 2), and that the information is related to

the program sequence of the domestic appliance (Fig 2). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the visual display of Midlang with the device of Voda to improve the device of Voda by providing an electric control panel that is integrally formed with a door device (Midlang, col 1, ln 49+). One would have been motivated to make this combination to provide the user feedback on the status of the refrigeration device (fig 2).

As for claim 14, Voda discloses that the illumination means is integrated in the door handle (38, Fig 3).

As for claim 16, Voda discloses that the visual signals emitted by the illuminating means via the door handle contain information whose content is connected to the closure state of the door (col 3, ln 45+).

As for claim 17, Voda discloses that the operation of the illuminating means being at least one of arranged in the door handle(38, Fig 3) is coupled to the locking device of the door (col 2, ln 35).

As for claim 18, Voda discloses that the illuminating means 38 being at least one of arranged in the door handle (fig 3) and is controlled by the appliance internal control system (40, 42, Fig 2).

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voda and Midlang, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Chien US PAT 5722760.

As for claims 19 and 20, Voda discloses the device as discussed above, but fails to teach or disclose the device with two illuminating means, wherein the operation of the

illumination means is individually controllable, and fails to teach that the illumination means are different colored. Chien teaches that it is conventional to construct light assemblies with individually controlled LEDs (col 1, ln 27+) to convey a message or conform to a selected design. Chien also teaches different colored illuminating means (col 1, ln 40-45). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the plurality of LEDs having different colors that are individually controllable of Chien with the device of Voda provide an improved illuminating and control means that allows individual control of the illuminating means for creating patterns, messages, or artistic purposes (Chien col 1, ln 15+).

Claims 13, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voda and Midlang, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Camarota et al. US 2003/0081401.

As for claim 13, 15, and 22, Voda discloses the device as discussed above, but fails to teach or disclose that the door handle is covered with a transparent shell at its front, LEDs as the light sources, and that the light source is optically connected to windows in the door handle. Camarota et al. teaches a door handle with a transparent shell at its front, LEDs 62 as a source of illumination, and shows that the LEDs are optically connected to windows 11, 16 in the door handle. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the lighted handle of Camarota having a transparent shell, LEDs, and windows optically connected to the LEDs with the device of Voda to provide an improved light source for the lighted handle of Voda, since the LEDs

of Camarota provide sufficient lighting and have a long service life (Camarota paragraphs 0065, 0067).

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voda and Midlang, as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Grisamore et al. US PAT 6132055.

As for claim 23, Voda discloses the device as discussed above, but fails to teach or disclose the domestic appliance includes at least one of a cooker, a washing machine, and a dryer. Grisamore teaches a cooker with a lighted handle (Fig 9). It would have been obvious to provide a cooker with a lighted handle, as shown by Grisamore, where it is desired to permit a cooking surface to be viewed at night (Grisamore col 1, ln 1-45). One would have been motivated to make this combination to give the lighted handle of Voda more utility by combining it with a cooker.

Claims 24-27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. US 2005/0091756 in view of Voda US PAT 2644882 and Camarota et al. US 2004/0062047.

As for claims 24, 25 and 27, Wright et al. discloses a housing 13 having a receptacle (Fig 1) for receiving laundry and an opening providing access to the receptacle, a door 16 mounted on the housing for closing the opening and including a door handle 18 and a control system 20 controlling operations of the washing machine. Wright fails to teach a door handle with a window that has a light source adjacent to it that emits through a window of the door handle. Voda teaches a light source in a door handle that is responsive to signals from a control system (Voda, col 3, ln 45+). Since

refrigerators and washing machines are both household appliances, it would have been obvious to use light sources in the handle of Voda that activate the light in response to a control system (in this case, the opening of the door Voda col 3, ln 45+) and to apply it to the washing machine of Wright to improve the device of Wright. One would have been motivated to make this combination to provide a means for illuminating an interior of the household appliance (Voda co1, ln 10+). As for providing a handle having a window with LEDs in it, Camarota teaches a lighted handle 10 with windows (sides of 11) with LEDs (62, paragraph 0068) in it. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the lighted handle having LEDs in the device of Wright and Voda to provide an improved lighted handle. One would have been motivated since the handle of Camarota has an improved light source that can provide sufficient lighting and that has a long service life (Camarota paragraphs 0065, 0067).

As for claim 26, see the discussion with respect to claim 24 for providing the window and the LEDs, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device as discussed above with a plurality of windows having LEDs, since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

As for claim 30, Wright further discloses a transparent shell facing outwardly from the housing (19, Fig 1).

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al., Voda, and Camarota et al. as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Peterson US 2003/00282271.

As for claims 28 and 29, Wright fails to teach or disclose multiple light sources that emit in a pre-determined pattern in response to an operating parameter of the washing machine. Peterson teaches a washing machine with a multiple light sources that emit in a pre-determined pattern in response to an operating parameter of the washing machine (paragraph 0161). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the LED control system corresponding to the mode of the washing machine of Peterson in the device of Wright to provide a LED lighting system for a washer that allows the user to know what mode of operation the device is in (Peterson paragraph 0161). As for displaying different colors in response to the operating parameters, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to display different colors of light in response to the mode of the washing machine to make the device more aesthetically pleasing. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Baek US 2005/0047162 Ogino et al. US 2006/0232378 disclose light emitting handles for car doors. Wolter et al. US 2005/00155597 discloses a light for a cooking apparatus.

Application/Control Number:  
10/588,582  
Art Unit: 2875

Page 8

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Evan Dzierzynski whose telephone number is (571)-272-2336. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandy O'shea can be reached on M-F (571)-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EPD

1/2/2008

/Ali Alavi/

Primary Examiner